

Remarks

The Office Action and the Examiner's comments have been carefully reviewed. The following remarks herein are considered to be fully responsive thereto. Claims 1-2, 4-10 and 12-20 remain in this application.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-10 and 12-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,161,112 issued to Cragun, et al. (Cragun) in further view of US Patent No. 6,601,232 issued to Burba, et al. (Burba).

In summary, each of independent claims 1, 9 and 16 distinguish over the combination of prior art of Cragun and Burba in the following underlined limitations of independent claim 1, noting that independent claims 9 and 16 have similar limitations.

means for embedding a customizing program in said requested original web page;

means for receiving said requested original Web page in which said program for customizing a page is embedded;

web browser means for displaying said received original Web page;

means for having said program display a control panel for a customizing operation;

means for customizing said original Web page according to a customizing operation by a user using said control panel while said original Web page is retained for other users; and,

means for storing data pertaining to said customizing operation, wherein said web page is dynamically restored with said customizing data when subsequently accessed by said user.

Initially, it is noted that pages 2-5 of the Final Rejection essentially repeat the prior art rejection of the previous Office Action, which was addressed in the RESPONSE of July 15, 2004, and that a new Response to Amendment is added on pages 5 and 6 which responds to the arguments of pages 7-10 of the previous RESPONSE. Accordingly, the Response to Amendment will be addressed first with the inventor Amane Nakajama's comments and analysis on the Response to Amendment.

"13. Applicant alleges that Cragun's presentation control mechanism cannot be realized with an existing web browser. However, Cragun specifically provides that the best mode of the invention is to be realized (in col. 4, lines 34-42) with a specific type of web browser which is being invented by Cragun *in the patent* hence, this specific type of web browser does exist."

The inventor, Mr. Nakajama notes that Cragun states, "In the best mode of the invention, presentation control mechanism is a part of web browser", col. 4, lines 33-35. That means that it is necessary to develop or modify an existing web browser. It is, of course, possible to implement Cragun's presentation control mechanism in a new web browser. However, the present invention is more flexible and easy to implement in an existing web browser without changing the existing web browser.

"14. Applicant argues that the presented art does not disclose that customization occurs without changing the original web page. However, col. 11, lines 2-3 of Cragun disclose that the user customizes a web page to his or her own individual taste, therefore the original web page from the serve 230 of Fig. 5 does not change and is retained for the other user."

Mr. Nakajama notes that the present invention customizes web pages without changing the original web page, and that the customization is stored and can be restored at a later time. In Cragun, the customization may be done without changing the original web page, however, the customization cannot be stored. Hence, the customization a user makes to the web page is lost when the user exits the web page.

This distinction is present in the last two subparagraphs of independent claim 1 (with similar limitations in independent claims 9 and 16) as,

means for storing data pertaining to said customizing operation, wherein said web page is dynamically restored with said customizing data when subsequently accessed by said user.

"15. Applicant argues that the claimed invention involves embedding of the customizing program, but Burba uses CGI, which is not directly embedded in the HTML pages of Burba. However, in col. 3, lines 25-45, Burba edits HTML pages to allow them to work with CGI, thereby embedding features in the pages that allow the CGI to work."

Mr. Nakajama notes that Burba states "In order to implement the system provided herein, the processing device may store the pre-existing templates and interfaces as HTML documents or HTML formats", col. 3, lines 26-28. That means that the templates and interfaces may use the HTML format. The templates and interfaces are embedded in the original web page.

In regard to claims 1, 9 and 16, the Examiner asserts that Cragun teaches a means for receiving a requested original web page in which a program for customizing a page is embedded. In support of this assertion, the Examiner cites Figure 5, element 129, as the "embedded" program.

Independent claims 1, 9 and 16 set forth respective means (and step) for

embedding a customizing program in the requested original web page. The advantage of embedding a customizer program in the web page according to the present invention is that the customizer can be implemented without changing existing web servers or web browsers (i.e., a standard web browser may be implemented, with no requirement of a browser plug-in or separate program logic).

This is distinct from the presentation control mechanism described in Cragun (Figure 5, element 129). In Cragun, the presentation control mechanism is not embedded in the web page but, as described in the passage indicted by the Examiner at Col. 4, lines 34-42, the presentation control mechanism is part of the web-browser, is another computer program in a computer system, may be part of the operating system or comprises a plug-in for the web browser.

It is very significant that Col. 4, lines 34-42, list four different alternative embodiments, none of which comprise the approach of the present invention of embedding the presentation control mechanism in the web page, which has advantages as noted hereinbelow.

Accordingly, Cragun's presentation control mechanism cannot be realized with an existing web browser. It appears necessary in Cragun to develop a new web browser in order to realize the customization mechanism available in Cragun.

In further distinction over Cragun, the dependent claims of the present invention set forth how the customization is separately stored, e.g. locally or via an attached server, without changing the original web page. These claims additionally set forth how the stored customization is dynamically restored when a user accesses the original web page. Moreover, the present invention describes the customizer's structure and technical details.

According to the structure described, the customizer of the present invention can be implemented without changing existing web servers, web browsers, and or web pages.

The Examiner further cited the patent to Burba in order to overcome the deficiencies of Cragun, wherein the Examiner states “Cragun et al. fails to disclose means for embedding a customizing program in said requested original web page.”

The Examiner cites Burba for teaching online web page testing procedures having program embedding in the web page, wherein the embedded program allows for a “user to open, create, edit, delete, change and modify the online testing procedure of the web page.” Burba particularly teaches a method of creating and documenting a test procedure. The method provides an interface for creating and modifying a test procedure, and creates or modifies the test procedure according to the input gathered from an interface. As shown in Figure 8, a server program called STEP_GEN_HEADER.CGI creates a test procedure according to the input received from a screen such as illustrated in Figure 7.

The method of Burba does not embed a customizing program in a requested web page. The customizing program is executed within a server; therefore the customizing program is outside of the user requested web page. It must be noted from the server program example of Figure 8, that CGI is a common means for running a program in a web server, and further, that the CGI file as presented is stored in a web server and not in a web page.

The method of Burba as disclosed cannot customize an existing web page. Burba teaches that the method customizes a test procedure written in a specified format and not

that of an ordinary web page written in HTML. Rather, the method uses a web page in HTML format for providing an interface for creating and customizing a test procedure.

The presently claimed invention customizes an existing web page by embedding a customizing program in a requested web page, and by letting the customizing program add or delete any HTML objects (e.g., text, image, hyperlink, table, Java applet) in addition to changing the attributes of the HTML objects. The present invention stores the program customizations in a separate customization server (claim 4). Hence, it can customize an existing web page without changing its original web page that is stored in a web server. Further, the present invention provides for the merger of the program customizations, which are separately stored in a customization server, with the original web page contents whenever a customized page is accessed. The display status of each customized HTML object is controlled, thus allowing for a customization to be displayed to a first user and not a second user.

In contrast, Burba does not embed a customizing program in a requested web page. Further, Burba does not customize an existing web page in HTML format in addition to not teaching the customization of an existing web page. The combination of Cragun and Burba does not teach all of the elements of the invention as presently claimed.

As cited, Burba does not cure the above-mentioned deficiencies of Cragun. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 9 and 16 are allowable for the above reasons and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-10 and 12-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

In view of the above, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "William C. Roch". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "William" and last name "Roch" clearly distinguishable.

William C. Roch
Registration No. 24,972

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343
WCR:bk